arXiv:1410.8287v3 [math.AG] 12 Mar 2015

GENERALIZED COMPACTIFICATIONS OF BATYREV HYPERSURFACE FAMILIES

KARL FREDRICKSON

Abstract. We show how Calabi-Yau hypersurface families arising from Batyrev's construction can be resolved and compactified using a type of fan more general than an MPCP resolution. This can lead to smooth projective compactifications that are not obtainable from the original construction. In the threefold case, we show that generic members of the resulting family are always smooth.

1. Introduction

Batyrev's fundamental construction of Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in [2] provides both a large source of Calabi-Yau families and a very explicit construction of mirror symmetry for these families. Let us recall the basic setup. Let $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^d$ for some d be a lattice, and consider the corresponding real vector space $N_{\mathbb{R}} = N \otimes \mathbb{R}$, the dual lattice $M = \mathrm{Hom}(N, \mathbb{Z})$, and the dual vector space $M_{\mathbb{R}} = M \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Also let $\langle , \rangle$ be the natural real-valued dual pairing between $M_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. A lattice polytope in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the convex hull of finitely many lattice points in N. (For an introduction to toric geometry, see the books [6] or [8].)

To construct a Calabi-Yau hypersurface family, we first need a reflexive polytope [2]. A lattice polytope $\Delta \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$ with the origin in its interior is said to be *reflexive* if its dual polytope

$$\Delta^* = \{m \in M_{\mathbb{R}} \mid \langle m, n \rangle \geq -1 \text{ for all } n \in \Delta\}$$

is also lattice polytope in $M_{\mathbb{R}}$. The Calabi-Yau hypersurface family associated to Δ is a compactification of the hypersurface family in the torus $\mathrm{Spec}\ \mathbb{C}[M] \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ defined by

$$\sum_{m \in M \cap \Delta^*} c_m z^m = 0 \tag{1}$$

where the $c_m \in \mathbb{C}$ are generic coefficients.

To compactify this family, the open torus $\mathrm{Spec}\ \mathbb{C}[M]$ needs to be included into a larger toric variety. One natural choice is the toric variety $X(\Delta)$ given by the fan $\Sigma(\Delta)$, the fan of cones over proper faces of Δ. In the case that the toric variety defined by $\Sigma(\Delta)$ is smooth, this yields a family $\mathcal{X}(\Delta) \subseteq X(\Delta)$ of smooth projective Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces. In general, however, $X(\Delta)$ is not smooth, and to desingularize the Calabi-Yau family as much as possible, we require another important ingredient of Batyrev's construction, an MPCP (maximal projective

crepant partial) resolution of $X(\Delta)$. An *MPCP resolution* of the toric variety $X(\Delta)$ is defined by a fan $\widehat{\Sigma}(\Delta)$ which satisfies the following two conditions:

(i) $\widehat{\Sigma}(\Delta)$ is complete, simplicial, projective, and a subdivision of $\Sigma(\Delta)$.
(ii) The set of rays of $\widehat{\Sigma}(\Delta)$ is equal to the set of rays over nonzero lattice points in Δ.

If Δ is of dimension four or less, then Equation (1) will define a family of smooth Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces in the toric variety given by $\widehat{\Sigma}(\Delta)$.

The purpose of this paper is to study what happens when the hypersurface family defined by Equation (1) is compactified and resolved with a type of fan more general than an MPCP resolution, which we call a Δ-maximal fan. A Δ-*maximal fan* has the same definition as an MPCP resolution, only without the requirements that it has to be a subdivision of $\Sigma(\Delta)$ or projective. This paper is devoted to proving smoothness and regularity results for the toric variety $X(\Sigma)$ associated to a Δ-maximal fan Σ, and for the anticanonical hypersurface family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma) \subseteq X(\Sigma)$.

These questions have already been studied for a particular example in [7]. It concerned a four-dimensional *smooth Fano polytope* Δ (i.e., a reflexive polytope with the property that the toric variety $X(\Delta)$ is smooth), so a family of smooth Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces $\mathcal{X}(\Delta) \subseteq X(\Delta)$ exists without the need for an MPCP resolution. Nonetheless, there is another simplicial fan with the same set of rays as $\Sigma(\Delta)$, giving another compactification $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$. Members of $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$ are smooth projective Calabi-Yau varieties that are topologically distinct from those of $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$. By further analyzing Calabi-Yau varieties with the same Hodge numbers in Kreuzer and Skarke's database [10], it was shown that members of $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$ are topologically distinct from all other CY varieties that come from MPCP resolutions of reflexive four-polytopes. The fact that topologically distinct Calabi-Yau families can be produced is one of the reasons why Δ-maximal fans are interesting. For a further discussion of this example we refer to Section 5.

Let us describe organization and main results of this paper.

In Section 2 we prove that for a reflexive polytope Δ and a Δ-maximal fan Σ of arbitrary dimension $X(\Sigma)$ always has a singular locus of codimension ≥ 4 (Proposition 2.2).

Sections 3 and 4 focus on reflexive polytopes of dimension four. It follows from Proposition 2.2 that in this case a Δ-maximal fan Σ must be Gorenstein. This means the anticanonical line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ of $X(\Sigma)$ exists and the family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ can be defined by taking generic global sections of $\mathcal{L}$. We show that generic members of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ have at worst isolated singularities occuring at zero-dimensional toric strata of $X(\Sigma)$ (Proposition 3.5). Proposition 3.6 and Definition 3.7 then give a combinatorial criterion (the notion of a reflexive 4-polytope having "good maximal cones") that suffices to show generic members of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ are smooth at these remaining points.

In section 4, we prove that this combinatorial condition always holds, so that generic members of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ are smooth for any reflexive 4-polytope Δ and Δ-maximal fan Σ (Theorem 4.9). The proof uses the secondary fan associated to the set of lattice points in Δ. At the beginning of the section we briefly introduce the definitions and facts about the secondary fan and wall crossings that will be needed for the proof.

As mentioned above, Section 5 discusses a particular example of a Δ-maximal fan and the associated family of smooth CY threefolds.

Section 6 describes how our main result can be applied to the problem of constructing an *extremal transition* between two families of CY threefolds, given a nested pair of reflexive 4-polytopes $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$.

It may be useful to briefly explain why analyzing the members of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ is more difficult in the case of an arbitrary Δ-maximal fan than an MPCP resolution. In Batyrev's construction generic members of the hypersurface family satisfy a condition called "Δ-regularity" (Definition 3.1.1 from [2]), which implies that all their singularities are inherited from the singularities of the ambient toric variety. Thus, if the toric variety is sufficiently smooth (as in the case of an MPCP subdivision of a reflexive four-polytope), generic anticanonical hypersurfaces in the toric variety will be smooth. Because hypersurfaces in a more general Δ-maximal fan need not satisfy Δ-regularity, singularities of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ could potentially occur even on a smooth open subset of $X(\Sigma)$.

Lastly, it bears mentioning for future work that these results could potentially be applied to the complete intersection Calabi-Yau families studied by Batyrev and Borisov [3,4], since resolving such a family also requires an MPCP subdivision of a reflexive polytope.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank the organizers of the conference "Calabi-Yau Manifolds and their Moduli" for the invitation to speak. I would also like to thank Benjamin Nill for substantial help with the results in the paper, including the proof of Proposition 2.2, as well as help with writing and organization.

2. Δ-maximal fans and their singular locus

Let us first fix some notation. Given points $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ in a real vector space, we use $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ to denote their convex hull. We also define

$$\mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = \{r_1 v_1 + \cdots + r_n v_n \mid r_1, \ldots r_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\},$$

the convex cone generated by $v_1, \ldots, v_n$. A cone is said to be pointed, or strongly convex, if it contains no nontrivial linear subspaces of the ambient vector space.

Given a fan Σ in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$, $X(\Sigma)$ will always denote the toric variety obtained from Σ. Where appropriate, $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ will denote the family of generic anticanonical hypersurfaces in $X(\Sigma)$. Given any fan Σ, we write $\Sigma^{[n]}$ for the subfan consisting of all cones of Σ of dimension n or less.

For a facet (maximal proper face) F of a reflexive polytope $\Delta \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$, we will sometimes make use of the outer normal to F, $u_F \in M$. This is defined as the unique lattice point such that $\langle u_F, x\rangle = 1$ for all $x \in F$. In terms of the dual polytope $\Delta^* \subseteq M_{\mathbb{R}}$ defined before, u_F is the negative of the vertex $v \in \Delta^*$ dual to F.

Let us define the object of study of this paper.

Definition 2.1. Given a fan Σ and a reflexive polytope Δ, we say Σ is Δ-*maximal* if it satisfies the following:

1. The set of rays of Σ is equal to the set of rays over nonzero lattice points in Δ.
2. Σ is complete and simplicial.

The crucial difference between this definition and the definition of an MPCP resolution is that the fan associated to an MPCP resolution must be a subdivision of $\Sigma(\Delta)$, whereas there is no such restriction on a Δ-maximal fan. Also, note that we do not require Σ to be projective.

Our first result shows that it is possible to generalize well-known statements about MPCP resolutions in [2] to this more general situation. Let us recall that a (necessarily simplicial) cone is *unimodular*, if it is spanned by a lattice basis. A fan is *unimodular*, if all its maximal cones are unimodular (equivalently, the associated toric variety is smooth).

Proposition 2.2. *Let Δ be a reflexive polytope and Σ a Δ-maximal fan.*

(1) *Any cone of Σ of dimension at most 3 is unimodular. In particular, the toric variety $X(\Sigma)$ has a singular locus of codimension ≥ 4.*
(2) *Any cone of Σ of dimension 4 is unimodular, if it is not contained in a maximal cone of $\Sigma(\Delta)$. In particular, the toric variety $X(\Sigma^{[4]})$ is Gorenstein.*

Remark 2.3. Let us note that these results are optimal in the following sense. First, there exist reflexive polytopes Δ in dimension 4 such that every lattice point in Δ is a vertex, and the fan $\Sigma(\Delta)$ is simplicial but not unimodular. Hence, $\Sigma(\Delta)$ is Δ-maximal but not unimodular. Second, it is computationally straightforward to find five linearly independent lattice points in the dual reflexive 5-polytope Δ^* associated to $\mathbb{P}^5$ such that the cone over these points is not contained in a maximal cone of $\Sigma(\Delta^*)$, it contains no other lattice points of Δ^*, and it is not unimodular. This cone can then be extended to a Δ^*-maximal fan.

Proof. Let us assume there exists a non-unimodular k-dimensional cone C in a Δ-maximal fan Σ with $2 \leq k \leq 4$. We may assume that k is chosen minimal. Let C be spanned by lattice points $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ in $\partial\Delta$. We consider the lattice parallelepiped

$$P = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i v_i \mid 0 \leq c_i \leq 1 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, k \right\}.$$

If C is not a unimodular cone, then P must contain a lattice point x which is not an integer linear combination of $v_1, \ldots, v_k$, so that $x = \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i v_i$, $a_i \in [0,1]$ (for $i = 1, \ldots, k$) with not all a_i integers. By the minimality assumption, we have $a_i \neq 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$. We may also assume that $a_1 + \cdots + a_k \leq \frac{k}{2}$, since otherwise we can replace x with the lattice point $v_1 + \cdots + v_k - x$, also contained in P. Since C is a cone in a Δ-maximal fan, x cannot be contained in Δ.

Let F be a maximal face of Δ such that x is contained in the cone over F. Let u_F be the outer normal to F. Then $2 \leq \langle u_F, x \rangle$ since $x \notin \Delta$ and $\langle u_F, x \rangle$ is an integer. On the other hand, $\langle u_F, x \rangle = \langle u_F, \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i v_i \rangle \leq a_1 + \cdots + a_k \leq \frac{k}{2}$, because each $\langle u_F, v_i \rangle$ is no more than 1. This implies $4 \leq k$, hence $k = 4$ and $\langle u_F, v_i \rangle = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, so all $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ lie in F. □

3. CY-threefolds coming from Δ-maximal fans

We will now restrict our focus to the case of four-dimensional reflexive polytopes. It follows from Proposition 2.2 that given a reflexive 4-polytope Δ and a Δ-maximal fan Σ, that $X(\Sigma)$ is Gorenstein, and therefore we can define a family of hypersurfaces in $X(\Sigma)$ by taking global sections of the anticanonical bundle. Because the rays of Σ consist of all the rays over nonzero lattice points in Δ, the set of monomial global sections of the anticanonical bundle will be in bijective correspondence with lattice points in Δ^*, just as in the standard Batyrev construction. Thus in the equation

$$\sum_{m \in M \cap \Delta^*} c_m z^m = 0$$

from the introduction, we may consider the left-hand side as a generic global section of the anticanonical bundle of $X(\Sigma)$, defining the family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$.

We will need the following basic principle concerning lattice points in reflexive polytopes (note that the case of two vertices is contained in [12, Proposition 4.1]).

Lemma 3.1. *If $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are lattice points in a reflexive polytope Δ, then $v_1 + \cdots + v_k$ is contained in $r \cdot \partial\Delta$ for some integer $0 \leq r \leq k$, and $r = k$ if and only if $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are in a common proper face of Δ.*

Proof. Let F be a maximal face of Δ such that $v_1 + \cdots + v_k$ is contained in the cone over F. Then $v_1 + \cdots + v_k$ is in rF for $0 \leq r := \langle u_F, v_1 + \cdots + v_k \rangle \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \langle u_F, v_i \rangle \leq k$. Here, the upper equality implies that $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are in F. □

The following two lemmas will be used at later points in proving smoothness.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $C = \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, v_2)$ be a two-dimensional cone in a Δ-maximal fan Σ, where v_1 and v_2 are lattice points in $\partial\Delta$. Then the line segment $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_2)$ is contained in $\partial\Delta$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 for $n = 2$, either v_1 and v_2 are contained in a common proper face of Δ, or $v_1 + v_2$ is contained in Δ. In the second case, we would have that the nonzero lattice point $v_1 + v_2$ is in the relative interior of C, which is not possible since then the ray over $v_1 + v_2$ would not be a ray of Σ, and Σ could

not be Δ-maximal. It follows that v_1 and v_2 are in a common face f of Δ, and therefore $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_2) \subseteq f \subseteq \partial\Delta$. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $C = \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ is a cone in a Δ-maximal fan, with v_1, v_2, v_3 lattice points in $\partial\Delta$, not contained in a common facet. Then:*

1. *There exists a vertex m of Δ^* such that $\langle m, v_i\rangle = \langle m, v_j\rangle = -1$ for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $\langle m, v_k\rangle = 0$ for the remaining $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*
2. *For a fixed choice of i, j, k such that $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$, there is at most one lattice point $m \in \Delta^*$ such that $\langle m, v_i\rangle = \langle m, v_j\rangle = -1$ and $\langle m, v_k\rangle = 0$.*

Proof. For part 1, by Lemma 3.1, we must have that either $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 \in 2 \cdot \partial\Delta$ or $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 \in \partial\Delta$. In the latter case, C could not be a cone in a Δ-maximal fan. Thus we have $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 \in 2 \cdot \partial\Delta$, and $(v_1 + v_2 + v_3)/2$ must be contained in some facet of Δ. Let m be the vertex of Δ^* dual to this facet. We must have that $\langle m, (v_1 + v_2 + v_3)/2\rangle = -1$, and since $\langle m, v_1\rangle$, $\langle m, v_2\rangle$ and $\langle m, v_3\rangle$ must be integers ≥ -1, the only way to achieve this is to have $\langle m, v_i\rangle = \langle m, v_j\rangle = -1$ for exactly two $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, and $\langle m, v_k\rangle = 0$ for the remaining $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

For part 2, assume without loss that $i = 1$, $j = 2$, $k = 3$. Since m evaluates to identically -1 on $T = \mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_2, (v_1 + v_2 + v_3)/2)$, the triangle T must be contained in the boundary of Δ.

We claim that T cannot be contained in a two-dimensional face of Δ. Suppose by contradiction that $T \subseteq g$ for some two-dimensional face $g \subseteq \partial\Delta$. Note that $g \cap C$ is a two-dimensional polygon $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_2, w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ for some points $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in C$. If we let A be the two-dimensional affine space spanned by T, then by calculation, the intersection of A with the relative boundary of C consists of the line segment $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_2)$ and the two rays $v_1 + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_3$, $v_2 + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}v_3$. Because $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_3)$ and $\mathrm{Conv}(v_2, v_3)$ are contained in $\partial\Delta$ by Lemma 3.2, the only part of this intersection contained in $\partial\Delta$ is $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, v_2)$.

Thus $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ must be contained in the relative interior of C. Because C is a cone in a Δ-maximal fan, $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ cannot be lattice points. However, since the w_i are in the relative interior of C, they would have to be vertices of the entire face g. This is a contradiction since g is a lattice polytope.

It follows that no two distinct lattice points $m, q \in \Delta^*$ can both evaluate to identically -1 on T, because otherwise T would be contained in the face

$$\{d \in \Delta \mid \langle m, d\rangle = \langle q, d\rangle = -1\}$$

of Δ, which would have to be of dimension ≤ 2. $\square$

We will also need to make use of a generic smoothness result, Lemma 3.1 from [7], which can be proven by a short argument with Sard's theorem.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $a_0, \ldots, a_r \in \mathbb{C}$, and let*

$$f = a_0 z^{m_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i z^{m_i}$$

be a regular function on

$$(\mathbb{C}^*)^s \times \mathbb{C}^t \cong \mathrm{Spec}\ \mathbb{C}[z_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, z_s^{\pm 1}, z_{s+1}, \ldots, z_{s+t}],$$

where z^{m_i} for $0 \leq i \leq r$ are regular Laurent monomials on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^s \times \mathbb{C}^t$ and z^{m_0} is invertible on $(\mathbb{C}^*)^s \times \mathbb{C}^t$. Then for generic values of $a_0, \ldots, a_r$, the affine variety $V(a_0, \ldots, a_r) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^*)^s \times \mathbb{C}^t$ defined by $f = 0$ is nonsingular.

Eventually we will be able to state a combinatorial condition for generic members of the family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ to be smooth. We begin with the following result, which shows that singularities of generic anticanonical hypersurfaces can only occur at certain zero-dimensional torus orbits of $X(\Sigma)$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let Δ be a reflexive 4-polytope and Σ a Δ-maximal fan. Then:*

(1) *If s is a generic global section of the anticanonical bundle of $X(\Sigma)$, then $s = 0$ defines a hypersurface $Y \subseteq X(\Sigma)$ with at worst isolated singularities.*
(2) *Any isolated singularities of Y must occur at zero-dimensional toric strata of $X(\Sigma)$ corresponding to cones $\mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$ with $v_1, \ldots, v_4 \in \partial\Delta$ lattice points not contained in a common face of Δ.*

Proof. To prove part 1, we will prove that $Y \cap X(\Sigma^{[3]})$ is smooth. This is sufficient to show that Y has isolated singularities since $X(\Sigma) \backslash X(\Sigma^{[3]})$ is zero-dimensional.

First we verify that the smaller set $Y \cap X(\Sigma^{[2]})$ is smooth. Let $C = \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, v_2)$ be a two-dimensional cone of Σ with v_1, v_2 lattice points in Δ. By Lemma 3.2, v_1 and v_2 are contained in some common face of Δ, so there is a lattice point $m \in \Delta^*$ with $\langle m, v_i \rangle = -1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Considering the generic global section s restricted to the open affine set $U = \mathrm{Spec}\, \mathbb{C}[\check{C} \cap M] \subseteq X(\Sigma)$, where $\check{C}$ is the dual cone to C, $c_m z^m$ is an invertible monomial term in s. We also have that C is a smooth cone by Proposition 2.2, implying that $U \cong \mathbb{C}^2 \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^2$. So by Lemma 3.4, $Y \cap U$ is smooth.

Now let $C = \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, v_2, v_3)$ be a three-dimensional cone of Σ with v_1, v_2, v_3 lattice points in Δ and $U \subseteq X(\Sigma)$ the corresponding open affine. By Proposition 2.2, C is a smooth cone, and $U \cong \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^*$. First assume that v_1, v_2, v_3 are contained in a common face. Then the same argument as in the previous paragraph shows $Y \cap U$ is smooth.

Now suppose that v_1, v_2, v_3 are not contained in a common face. We still have that $U \cong \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^*$. In this case, the defining equation of $Y \cap U$ will not have an invertible term as above, but it will have a linear term, which we now show will be enough to imply smoothness.

Since C is a smooth cone by Proposition 2.2, we can extend v_1, v_2, v_3 to a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of N by adding a vector $u_4 \in N$. Let the basis of M dual to $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, u_4\}$ be $\{v_1', v_2', v_3', u_4'\}$. Then the dual cone $\check{C}$ is equal to $\mathrm{Cone}(v_1', v_2', v_3', u_4', -u_4')$, and the ring of functions on U is $\mathbb{C}[\check{C} \cap M] = \mathbb{C}[z^{v_1'}, z^{v_2'}, z^{v_3'}, z^{u_4'}, z^{-u_4'}]$.

By part 1 of Lemma 3.3, up to a relabeling of v_1, v_2, v_3, there exists a lattice point $m \in \Delta^*$ such that $\langle m, v_1 \rangle = \langle m, v_2 \rangle = -1$ and $\langle m, v_3 \rangle = 0$. On U, the lattice point m corresponds to the monomial $z^{v_3'} z^{a u_4'}$ where $a = 1 + \langle m, u_4 \rangle$. By part 2 of Lemma 3.3, all other lattice points $\ell \in \Delta^*$ must correspond to monomials $z^{c_1 v_1'} z^{c_2 v_2'} z^{c_3 v_3'} z^{c_4 u_4'}$ on U, where c_1, c_2, c_3 are non-negative integers, and either $c_1 + c_2 \geq 1$ or $c_3 \geq 2$. (This is because $c_i = 1 + \langle \ell, v_i \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.)

Let $p \in \mathbb{C}[z^{v_1'}, z^{v_2'}, z^{v_3'}, z^{u_4'}, z^{-u_4'}]$ be a local representative of the section s on U. Let the coefficient of p on the monomial $z^{v_3'} z^{au_4'}$ be $A \in \mathbb{C}$. Then the partial of p with respect to $z^{v_3'}$ is

$$Q = Az^{au_4'} + q(z^{v_1'}, z^{v_2'}, z^{v_3'}, z^{u_4'}, z^{-u_4'})$$

where q is such that $q(0,0,0,z^{u_4'}, z^{-u_4'}) = 0$. As $z^{au_4'}$ is invertible on U, we can conclude that $Q \neq 0$ when $z^{v_1'} = z^{v_2'} = z^{v_3'} = 0$ for generic values of A, and therefore the zero locus of p is nonsingular at the set of points in U where $z^{v_1'} = z^{v_2'} = z^{v_3'} = 0$. All other points of U are contained in $X(\Sigma^{[2]})$, where we have already shown Y is smooth.

For part 2, we have established that any singularities of Y must occur in the set $X(\Sigma)\backslash X(\Sigma^{[3]})$, which is the set of zero-dimensional torus orbits in $X(\Sigma)$, corresponding to maximal cones of Σ. Suppose $C = \text{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$ is a maximal cone and the v_i are all contained in some common facet of Δ, with dual vertex m. If U is the open affine subset of $X(\Sigma)$ defined by C, Y will not contain the unique zero-dimensional torus orbit $t \in U$. This is because at t, the monomial z^m in the defining equation of Y is nonzero while all others vanish. It follows that $Y \cap U \subseteq X(\Sigma^{[3]})$ is smooth, and any singularities of Y must occur on an open affine corresponding to $\text{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$ with $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ not in a common face of Δ. $\square$

Having established Proposition 3.5, we can now give a sufficient condition for determining when generic members of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ are smooth, which depends only on the geometry of Δ and the fan Σ. We need only check for smoothness at the remaining zero-dimensional torus orbits specified by part 2 of Proposition 3.5. The idea behind the following sufficient condition is that it will ensure the local definining equation of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ at these points has a lowest term that is linear, and therefore has a nonvanishing partial derivative.

Proposition 3.6. *Let Δ be a reflexive 4-polytope and Σ a Δ-maximal fan. Then a sufficient condition for generic members of the family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ to be smooth is as follows: for every maximal cone $\text{Cone}(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \in \Sigma$ with $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ lattice points of Δ that are not contained in a common proper face of Δ,*

$$v_1 + \cdots + v_4 \in 3 \cdot \partial\Delta.$$

Proof. Assume the condition holds for a cone $C = \text{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$. Then $(v_1 + \cdots + v_4)/3 \in \partial\Delta$, so it is contained in some maximal proper face $f \subseteq \Delta$ with dual vertex $m \in \Delta^*$. To have $\langle m, (v_1 + \cdots + v_4)/3\rangle = -1$ we must have $\langle m, v_i\rangle = \langle m, v_j\rangle = \langle m, v_k\rangle = -1$ for exactly three v_i, v_j, v_k and $\langle m, v_\ell\rangle = 0$ for the remaining v_ℓ. Assume $i = 1, j = 2, k = 3, \ell = 4$.

By Proposition 2.2, we know that $\{v_1, \ldots, v_4\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of N. If v_i' for $1 \leq i \leq 4$ is the dual basis, then the affine open subset of $X(\Sigma)$ corresponding to C is $U = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\check{C} \cap M] = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[z^{v_1'}, \ldots, z^{v_4'}] \cong \mathbb{C}^4$. On U, m corresponds to the monomial $z^{v_4'}$. Therefore a local representative of a generic global section of the anticanonical bundle on U, $p(z^{v_1'}, \ldots, z^{v_4'})$, will have a linear term in $z^{v_4'}$, and no constant term. It follows immediately that the partial of p with respect to $z^{v_4'}$ will

be nonvanishing at the point $z^{v_1'} = \cdots = z^{v_4'} = 0$ (the unique zero-dimensional torus orbit in U), implying that generic members of $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ are smooth at this point. $\square$

Based on Proposition 3.6, it is natural to introduce the following condition on a reflexive four-polytope Δ that will guarantee smoothness of the anticanonical hypersurface families in all Δ-maximal fans.

Definition 3.7. Let Δ be a reflexive four-polytope. We say that C is a *maximal cone* associated to Δ if $C = \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$ for linearly independent lattice points $v_1, \ldots, v_4 \in \Delta$, and $\mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4) \cap \Delta \cap N = \{0, v_1, \ldots, v_4\}$. We say that C is a *good maximal cone* if either

$$v_1 + \cdots + v_4 \in 3 \cdot \partial\Delta$$

or

$$v_1 + \cdots + v_4 \in 4 \cdot \partial\Delta.$$

We say Δ *has good maximal cones* if all maximal cones associated to Δ are good. We say a Δ-maximal fan Σ has good maximal cones if all four-dimensional cones of Σ are good.

4. Proof of main result via wall crossings

In this section, we prove our main result, which is that any reflexive four-polytope Δ has good maximal cones, and thus any Δ-maximal fan Σ is associated to an anticanonical hypersurface family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ whose generic members are smooth. Before proceeding to the proof, we first introduce necessary ideas from the theory of the secondary fan.

4.1. **The Secondary Fan.** Roughly speaking, the *secondary fan* associated to a list of rational vectors $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a way to parametrize certain fans in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ with cones generated by $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$. Throughout our discussion, we will assume that $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ span $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. We also will always assume that $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ is "geometric" as defined in [6], Section 15.1, meaning that all ν_i are nonzero and no ν_i is a positive scalar multiple of another. We will mostly use the same notation and approach as [6], Chapters 14 and 15. Other sources on the secondary fan (also known as the GKZ decompsition for its discoverers Gel'fand, Kapranov, and Zelevinsky) include [5, 9, 13].

The secondary fan consists of cones associated to certain pairs $(\Sigma, I_\emptyset)$, where $I_\emptyset \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$, and Σ is a "generalized fan" in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. A generalized fan has the same definition as a fan (a finite set of rational convex polyhedral cones in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that if $C_1, C_2 \in \Sigma$, $C_1 \cap C_2 \in \Sigma$, and if C' is a face of $C \in \Sigma$, then $C' \in \Sigma$), but the cones are not required to be pointed; in other words, they may contain a nontrivial linear subspace of $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. A generalized fan which is a fan in the usual sense is called nondegenerate. Otherwise, it is said to be degenerate.

The *support* $|\Sigma|$ of a generalized fan Σ is the set of points in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ contained in some cone of Σ. A *support function* for Σ is a continuous piecewise linear function $\varphi : |\Sigma| \to \mathbb{R}$, such that the restriction of φ to each cone of Σ is linear. A support

function $\varphi : |\Sigma| \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *strictly convex* if it is convex and its maximal domains of linearity are exactly the maximal cones of Σ.

The following definition is the same as [6], Definition 14.4.2.

Definition 4.1. Suppose we have a spanning geometric set of rational vectors $\nu_1, \ldots \nu_r \in N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Consider pairs $(\Sigma, I_\emptyset)$ satisfying the following:

(1) Σ is a generalized fan in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $I_\emptyset \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$.
(2) The support of Σ, $|\Sigma|$, equals $\mathrm{Cone}(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r)$.
(3) There exists a strictly convex support function for Σ.
(4) For each $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we have that $\sigma = \mathrm{Cone}(\nu_i \mid \nu_i \in \sigma, i \notin I_\emptyset)$.

Then the *GKZ cone* $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ is defined as

$$\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset} = \{(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in \mathbb{R}^r \mid \text{there is a convex piecewise linear support function } \varphi : |\Sigma| \to \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } \varphi(\nu_i) = -a_i \text{ for } i \notin I_\emptyset \text{ and } \varphi(\nu_i) \geq -a_i \text{ for } i \in I_\emptyset\}.$$

The results of [6], Section 14.4, show that if we consider all possible pairs $(\Sigma, I_\emptyset)$ allowed by Definition 4.1, then the GKZ cones $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset}$ fit together to form a generalized fan in $\mathbb{R}^r$, called $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$. The minimal cone of $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ (the intersection of all its cones) is the linear subspace $L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^r$ defined by

$$L = \{(\ell(\nu_1), \ldots, \ell(\nu_r)) \mid \ell : N_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R} \text{ is a linear map}\}.$$

The notation used by [6] for the quotient space $\mathbb{R}^r / L$ is $\widehat{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$. The image of each GKZ cone in $\widehat{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$ will be a pointed cone. Thus, we get a nondegenerate fan Σ_{GKZ} in $\widehat{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$. By definition, Σ_{GKZ} is the secondary fan associated to the vectors $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$. We use the notation $\Gamma_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset}$ for the cone in Σ_{GKZ} which is the image of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset}$.

We have the following important results about the structure of Σ_{GKZ} (see [6], Theorem 14.4.7 and Proposition 14.4.9).

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ be a spanning geometric set of rational vectors in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and let Σ_{GKZ} be the corresponding secondary fan in $\widehat{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then:*

(1) *The support of Σ_{GKZ} is convex and full-dimensional in $\widehat{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$.*
(2) *Every face of a cone $\Gamma_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset}$ is a cone of the form $\Gamma_{\Sigma', I'_\emptyset}$ for some pair $(\Sigma', I'_\emptyset)$.*
(3) *$\Gamma_{\Sigma', I'_\emptyset}$ is a face of $\Gamma_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset}$ if and only if Σ refines Σ' and $I'_\emptyset \subseteq I_\emptyset$.*
(4) *$\Gamma_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset}$ is a maximal cone of Σ_{GKZ} if and only if Σ is simplicial and the rays of Σ are exactly the rays over ν_i for $i \notin I_\emptyset$.*

From here on, $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ will always be the elements of $\partial\Delta \cap N$, where $\Delta \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$ is some fixed reflexive polytope. This implies that $\mathrm{Cone}(\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r) = N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Therefore, all generalized fans Σ defining a cone $\Gamma_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset} \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ will have support equal to $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. We also have that $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ is "primitive geometric", meaning that $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ is geometric, along with the extra condition that each ν_i is a primitive element of N. (An element $n \in N$ is primitive if it is not a positive integer multiple of some other element of N.)

The *moving cone* of the secondary fan, $\mathrm{Mov}_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$, is defined as the union of all cones $\Gamma_{\Sigma, I_\emptyset} \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ where $I_\emptyset$ is the empty set. Since $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ is geometric,

Propositions 15.1.4 and 15.1.5 of [6] say that $\mathrm{Mov}_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ is a full-dimensional convex polyhedral cone in $\widehat{G}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

In our case, it follows from the facts of Proposition 4.2 that maximal cones in the moving cone of the secondary fan correspond to complete projective simplicial fans whose rays are equal to the rays over the elements of $\partial\Delta \cap N$, in other words, projective Δ-maximal fans.

4.2. **Wall Crossings and Circuits.** To prove our main result we will use the theory of *wall crossings* in the secondary fan, as explained in [6], Section 15.3. Suppose we have distinct maximal cones $\Gamma_{\Sigma,\emptyset}$, $\Gamma_{\Sigma',\emptyset}$ in the moving cone that share a common codimension-1 face $\Gamma_{\Sigma_0,\emptyset}$. Then Σ and Σ' are said to be related by a wall crossing, and $\Gamma_{\Sigma_0,\emptyset}$ is called a "flipping wall". Σ and Σ' are both subdivisions of Σ_0, which is non-simplicial. In our case, Σ and Σ' are both projective Δ-maximal fans. It also follows from [6], Proposition 14.4.12, part b, that Σ_0 is a nondegenerate fan.

It turns out that a wall crossing is described by the data of an *oriented circuit* in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$, which we now define.

Let $n = \dim N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Suppose we have a set of $n+1$ nonzero vectors $W = \{w_1, \ldots, w_{n+1}\} \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$ which span $N_{\mathbb{R}}$. For our purposes we can assume that all $w_1, \ldots, w_{n+1}$ are elements of N. There is a linear dependence equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i w_i = 0$$

which is unique up to rescaling, with the b_i integers not all equal to zero. Set W_+ to be the set of w_i with $b_i > 0$, W_0 the set of w_i with $b_i = 0$, and W_- the set of W_i with $b_i < 0$.

The set of vectors $W_+ \cup W_-$ has the property that it is linearly dependent, but any proper subset is linearly independent. A set of vectors with this property is called a circuit. Rescaling the dependence equation will at most swap W_+ and W_-. A fixed choice of W_- and W_+ makes W an oriented circuit.

Define the sets of simplicial cones Σ_- and Σ_+ as

$$\Sigma_- = \{\sigma \mid \sigma \text{ is a face of } \mathrm{Cone}(w_1, \ldots, \widehat{w_i}, \ldots, w_{n+1}) \text{ for some } w_i \in W_+\}$$
$$\Sigma_+ = \{\sigma \mid \sigma \text{ is a face of } \mathrm{Cone}(w_1, \ldots, \widehat{w_i}, \ldots, w_{n+1}) \text{ for some } w_i \in W_-\},$$

where $\widehat{w_i}$ indicates that w_i is omitted. Then we have the following result (Lemma 15.3.10, [6]):

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that $C = \mathrm{Cone}(w_1, \ldots, w_{n+1})$ is pointed. Then W_- and W_+ are both nonempty, and Σ_- and Σ_+ are simplicial fans with support C.*

We can now describe how the main result on wall crossings in the secondary fan (Theorem 15.3.13, [6]) applies to our situation of interest. Let $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ be the elements of $\partial\Delta \cap N$ and let Σ_{GKZ} be the associated secondary fan. For a set $S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$, define $\sigma_S = \mathrm{Cone}(\nu_i \mid i \in S)$. Also, given any fan Σ in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$ and a cone $C \subseteq N_{\mathbb{R}}$, define $\Sigma|_C$ as $\{\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma, \sigma \subseteq C\}$, a subfan of Σ.

Theorem 4.4. *Let Σ and Σ' be projective Δ-maximal fans such that $\Gamma_{\Sigma,\emptyset}$ and $\Gamma_{\Sigma',\emptyset}$ share a common codimension-1 face $\Gamma_{\Sigma_0,\emptyset}$ in Σ_{GKZ}. Then Σ and Σ' are refinements of the nondegenerate complete fan Σ_0 which is not simplicial. The set of rays of Σ_0 is equal to the set of rays over $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$. There are disjoint sets $J_-, J_+ \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that we have an equation*

$$\sum_{i \in J_+} b_i \nu_i + \sum_{i \in J_-} b_i \nu_i = 0$$

where the b_i are integers such that $b_i < 0$ if $i \in J_-$ and $b_i > 0$ if $i \in J_+$.

We have the following facts:

1. *$\sigma_{J_- \cup J_+} \in \Sigma_0$, and either $\sigma_{J_+} \in \Sigma$ and $\sigma_{J_-} \in \Sigma'$, or $\sigma_{J_+} \in \Sigma'$ and $\sigma_{J_-} \in \Sigma$. (Up to relabeling of Σ and Σ', we can assume the former case.)*
2. *J_- and J_+ both have cardinality at least two. If $W_+ = \{\nu_i \mid i \in J_+\}$ $W_- = \{\nu_i \mid i \in J_-\}$, then the set of vectors $W_+ \cup W_-$ forms an oriented circuit.*
3. *If σ is a maximal non-simplicial cone in Σ_0, then there is a $J_0 \subseteq \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that $J = J_+ \cup J_0 \cup J_-$ is a disjoint union and $\sigma = \sigma_J$. If we let $W_0 = \{\nu_i \mid i \in J_0\}$, then $W = W_+ \cup W_0 \cup W_-$ has cardinality $1 + \dim N_{\mathbb{R}}$, and the subfans $\Sigma|_\sigma$ and $\Sigma'|_\sigma$ are respectively equal to the fans Σ_+ and Σ_- from Lemma 4.3.*

4.3. **Proof of main result.** We would like to show that any reflexive four-polytope Δ has good maximal cones. The strategy will be as follows. Any MPCP resolution of $\Sigma(\Delta)$ trivially has good maximal cones since its maximal cones are of the form $\mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$ with $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ in a common facet of Δ. At least one MPCP resolution of $\Sigma(\Delta)$ always exists by the results of [2], and represents a maximal cone in the moving cone of Σ_{GKZ}. Since the moving cone is convex of full dimension, we can move from any maximal cone in $\mathrm{Mov}_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ to another by a finite number of wall crossings. Thus it suffices to show that if Σ and Σ' are projective Δ-maximal fans related by a wall crossing, and one has good maximal cones, then the other does as well.

Once we know that all projective Δ-maximal fans have good maximal cones, we will prove that Δ has good maximal cones by showing that any maximal cone of Δ must be a cone in some projective Δ-maximal fan.

Thus, let Δ be a reflexive four-polytope and Σ and Σ' be two projective Δ-maximal fans related by a wall crossing, as in Theorem 4.4. The proof will be divided into two cases, depending on the cardinality of $J_- \cup J_+$.

First suppose that $J_- \cup J_+$ has four elements. Then it turns out that the lattice points in W_- and W_+ will be the opposite vertices of a square. This is the classical picture of an Atiyah flop. See Figure 1.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $e_1, \ldots, e_4$ be the standard basis of $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^4$. Up to a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear isomorphism, $W_+ = \{e_1, e_2\}$, and $W_- = \{e_3, -e_3 + e_1 + e_2\}$.*



FIGURE 1. Cross sections of the fan Σ and Σ'

Proof. Let $W_+ = \{w_1, w_2\}$ and $W_- = \{w_3, w_4\}$. Up to relabeling of Σ and Σ', it follows from Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.4 that

$$\text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3), \text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_4) \in \Sigma$$
$$\text{Cone}(w_1, w_3, w_4), \text{Cone}(w_2, w_3, w_4) \in \Sigma'.$$

Each of these four cones is smooth by Proposition 2.2. Since $\text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3)$ is smooth, there is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear isomorphism sending w_i to e_i for $i = 1, 2, 3$. By definition of W_+ and W_-, we have that $b_1 w_1 + b_2 w_2 = b_3 w_3 + b_4 w_4$ for positive integers b_i. It follows from smoothness of the other three cones that $w_4 = -e_3 + e_1 + e_2$. □

Proposition 4.6. *If $J_- \cup J_+$ has four elements and either Σ or Σ' has good maximal cones, then both do.*

Proof. Let $W_+ = \{w_1, w_2\}$ and $W_- = \{w_3, w_4\}$. According to Theorem 4.4, part 3, any cones of Σ not contained in Σ' must be contained in a cone of Σ_0 of the form $\text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5)$ for some other lattice point w_5 of Delta. In the notation of Theorem 4.4, $\text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5) = \sigma_J$. (There must be only one generator in addition to $w_1, \ldots, w_4$ because the cardinality of J must equal 1+dim $N_{\mathbb{R}} = 5$.) We must have that either $C_1 = \text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_5)$ and $C_2 = \text{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_4, w_5)$ are in Σ, or $C_3 = \text{Cone}(w_1, w_3, w_4, w_5)$ and $C_4 = \text{Cone}(w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5)$ are in Σ.

Assume without loss that C_1 and C_2 are in Σ. By assumption, Σ has good maximal cones. We must show that Σ' also has good maximal cones, which means showing that the cones $C_3, C_4 \in \Sigma'$ are good maximal cones. There are several cases to consider.

Case 1: Either $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_5 \in 4 \cdot \partial\Delta$ or $w_1 + w_2 + w_4 + w_5 \in 4 \cdot \partial\Delta$. Assume without loss that we are in the first case and $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_5 \in 4 \cdot \partial\Delta$. By Lemma 3.1, there must be some facet $F \subseteq \Delta$ such that $\langle u_F, w_i \rangle = 1$ for i = 1, 2, 3, and 5. It follows by linearity that $\langle u_F, w_4 \rangle = 1$, so w_i for $1 \leq i \leq 5$ are all contained in F. Thus by Lemma 3.1, $w_1 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5$ and $w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5$ are in $4 \cdot \partial\Delta$.

Case 2: Both $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_5$ and $w_1 + w_2 + w_4 + w_5$ are in $3 \cdot \partial\Delta$. Then there are faces $F, G \subseteq \Delta$ such that u_F evaluates to 1 on exactly three of w_1, w_2, w_3, w_5 and 0 on the remaining lattice point, and u_G evaluates to 1 on exactly three of w_1, w_2, w_4, w_5 and 0 on the remaining lattice point. We divide this into three subcases, 2A, 2B, and 2C.

Case 2A: Either $\langle u_F, w_5\rangle = 0$ or $\langle u_G, w_5\rangle = 0$. Then it follows by linearity that either $\langle u_F, w_i\rangle = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 4$ or $\langle u_G, w_i\rangle = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 4$. In either case we have that one of u_F or u_G evaluates to 3 on $w_1 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5$ and $w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5$, so C_3 and C_4 are good maximal cones.

Case 2B: u_F evaluates to identically zero on E_1 and u_G evaluates to identically zero on E_2, where E_1 and E_2 are opposite edges of the square $\mathrm{Conv}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$. Without loss, assume that $E_1 = \mathrm{Conv}(w_1, w_3)$ and $E_2 = \mathrm{Conv}(w_2, w_4)$. Then $\langle u_F, w_2\rangle = \langle u_F, w_4\rangle = \langle u_F, w_5\rangle = 1$ and $\langle u_F, w_3\rangle = 0$ implies that C_4 is a good maximal cone, while $\langle u_G, w_1\rangle = \langle u_G, w_3\rangle = \langle u_G, w_5\rangle = 1$ and $\langle u_G, w_4\rangle = 0$ implies C_4 is a good maximal cone.

Case 2C: u_F evaluates to identically zero on E_3 and u_G evaluates to identically zero on E_4, where E_3 and E_4 are adjacent edges of the square $\mathrm{Conv}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$. Without loss, assume that $E_3 = \mathrm{Conv}(w_1, w_3)$ and $E_4 = \mathrm{Conv}(w_1, w_4)$. Then we have that $\langle u_F, w_2\rangle = \langle u_F, w_4\rangle = \langle u_F, w_5\rangle = 1$ and $\langle u_G, w_2\rangle = \langle u_F, w_3\rangle = \langle u_F, w_5\rangle = 1$.

First assume that w_1, w_2 and w_5 are in a common facet of Δ. Then there is some facet $H \subseteq \Delta$ such that $\langle u_H, w_1\rangle = \langle u_H, w_2\rangle = \langle u_H, w_5\rangle = 1$. By integrality and the fact that $\langle u_H, p\rangle$ must be at most 1 for any $p \in \Delta$, it follows that $\langle u_H, w_3\rangle = \langle u_H, w_4\rangle = 1$ as well. But then we would be in Case 1.

Now assume w_1, w_2, w_5 are not in a common facet. We claim this is impossible. Notice that $-u_F$ and $-u_G$ are distinct lattice points of Δ^*. Also, $-u_F$ and $-u_G$ both evaluate to -1 on w_2 and w_5, and evaluate to 0 on w_1. We have that $\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_5)$ is a cone in the Δ-maximal fan Σ. By part 2 of Lemma 3.3, this situation is impossible. □

Proposition 4.7. *If $J_- \cup J_+$ has five elements and either Σ or Σ' has good maximal cones, then both do.*



FIGURE 2. Cross sections of the fan Σ_0 (top), Σ (lower left), and Σ' (lower right)

Proof. We may assume up to interchanging J_+ and J_- that J_+ has three elements and J_- has two elements. Then $W_+ = \{w_1, w_2, w_3\}$ and $W_- = \{w_4, w_5\}$.

$\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3)$ must be a cone of either Σ or Σ'; in the following proof we can assume without loss that it is a cone of Σ. Then the maximal cones of Σ not

contained in Σ' must be exactly $\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ and $\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_5)$. Likewise, the maximal cones of Σ' not contained in Σ must be exactly

$$\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_4, w_5),\ \mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_3, w_4, w_5),\ \mathrm{Cone}(w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5).$$

See Figure 2 for cross sections of the relevant cones in Σ_0, Σ, and Σ'. (Note this figure may be somewhat misleading, because the five vertices $w_1, \ldots, w_5$ will not always be contained in a common affine hyperplane.)

First suppose that w_1, w_2, w_3 are contained in some common facet $F \subseteq \Delta$. Let u_F be the facet normal to F. Applying u_F to the linear dependence equation $b_1w_1 + b_2w_2 + b_3w_3 = b_4w_4 + b_5w_5$, we get $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_4\langle u_F, w_4\rangle + b_5\langle u_F, w_5\rangle$. Since $\mathrm{Cone}(w_4, w_5)$ is a cone in Σ', we have by Lemma 3.2 that w_4 and w_5 are contained in some common facet of Δ, say G. Applying u_G to the same equation gives $b_1\langle u_G, w_1\rangle + b_2\langle u_G, w_2\rangle + b_3\langle u_G, w_3\rangle = b_4 + b_5$. Since $\langle u_F, w_i\rangle, \langle u_G, w_i\rangle \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 5$, and all the b_i are positive, we get that $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 \leq b_4 + b_5$ and $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 \geq b_4 + b_5$, so $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = b_4 + b_5$. This also implies that $\langle u_F, w_4\rangle = \langle u_F, w_5\rangle = 1$, so $w_1, \ldots, w_5$ are all in a common facet, and Σ and Σ' must both have good maximal cones.

Now assume that w_1, w_2, w_3 are not contained in a common facet. By part 1 of Lemma 3.3, there is a vertex m of Δ^*, with corresponding facet normal $u_F = -m$, such that (up to relabeling of w_1, w_2, w_3) $\langle u_F, w_1\rangle = \langle u_F, w_2\rangle = 1$, and $\langle u_F, w_3\rangle = 0$.

Since $\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ and $\mathrm{Cone}(w_1, w_2, w_3, w_5)$ are cones in the maximal fan Σ, $\{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$ and $\{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_5\}$ must be lattice bases by Proposition 2.2. Up to a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear isomorphism we may assume that $w_i = e_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, where e_i is the standard basis of $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^4$. Then if $\{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_5\}$ is a lattice basis, we must have that $w_5 = aw_1 + bw_2 + cw_3 - w_4$ for some integers a, b, c. This implies that $w_4 + w_5 = aw_1 + bw_2 + cw_3$. By definition of a circuit, there can be only one equation of linear dependence between $w_1, \ldots, w_5$ up to rescaling. Since $b_4w_4 + b_5w_5 = b_1w_1 + b_2w_2 + b_3w_3$ for positive b_i, we must have that a, b, c are positive integers. Applying u_F on both sides, we get that $\langle u_F, w_4\rangle + \langle u_F, w_5\rangle = a + b$. Since the LHS is at most two and the RHS is at least two, we get that $a = b = \langle u_F, w_4\rangle = \langle u_F, w_5\rangle = 1$. This implies that $\langle u_F, w_1+w_2+w_3+w_4+w_5\rangle = 4$, and $w_1 + w_2 + w_3 + w_4 + w_5 \in 4 \cdot \partial\Delta$. Then for any distinct $1 \leq i, j, k, \ell \leq 5$, we get that $w_i + w_j + w_k + w_\ell \in 3 \cdot \partial\Delta$ or $4 \cdot \partial\Delta$ (since if $w_i + w_j + w_k + w_\ell \in 2\Delta$, adding the remaining w_m for $1 \leq m \leq 5$ would give a lattice point in 3Δ). Thus Σ and Σ' both have good maximal cones. □

Propositions 4.6 and 4.7 establish that any projective Δ-maximal fan has good maximal cones. By the following lemma, this is enough to imply that Δ has good maximal cones.

Lemma 4.8. *Let Δ be a reflexive four-polytope and let C be a maximal cone of Δ. Then there exists a projective Δ-maximal fan Σ with $C \in \Sigma$.*

Proof. Let $C = \mathrm{Cone}(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4)$ with $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ lattice points in Δ. Let the vertices of Δ be $w_1, \ldots, w_r$. Consider the polytope

$$P = \mathrm{Conv}(av_1, av_2, av_3, av_4, w_1, \ldots, w_r)$$

where a is some sufficiently large positive number. Then P will contain the origin in its interior and have $\mathrm{Conv}(av_1, av_2, av_3, av_4)$ as a face. The fan of cones over proper faces of P, $\Sigma(P)$, is projective and will have $C \in \Sigma(P)$.

Let Σ_{GKZ} be the secondary fan associated to the elements $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$ of $\partial\Delta \cap N$. Then $\Gamma_{\Sigma(P),\emptyset}$ is cone in the moving cone of Σ_{GKZ}. Let Σ' be such that $\Gamma_{\Sigma',\emptyset}$ is a maximal cone of Σ_{GKZ} in the moving cone with $\Gamma_{\Sigma(P),\emptyset} \subseteq \Gamma_{\Sigma',\emptyset}$. Then Σ' is a projective Δ-maximal fan which is a refinement of $\Sigma(P)$, in particular, $C \in \Sigma'$. $\square$

We can now state the following main result:

Theorem 4.9. *Any reflexive 4-polytope Δ has good maximal cones. If Σ is any (possibly non-projective) Δ-maximal fan, then generic members of the anticanonical hypersurface family $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma)$ are smooth.*

Remark 4.10. If we view the secondary fan as parametrizing different compactifications of birational hypersurface families, then our main result can be understood as extending smooth CY compactifications to the entire moving cone, rather than just the set of cones corresponding to MPCP resolutions (which in general will form a smaller cone that is strictly contained in the moving cone).

As a related note, the secondary fan is an object of interest in mirror symmetry because it is related to the Kähler moduli space of a toric hypersurface family, as explained in [5], Section 6.2. From this point of view, a wall crossing in the secondary fan corresponds to a degeneration of the Kähler metric resulting in a birational contraction of a CY family to a singular family, followed by resolution to a possibly different CY family.

5. Example of CY-threefold from Δ-maximal fan

In this section we will look at the main example from [7] in the context of this paper. Fix the reflexive polytope Δ in $N \cong \mathbb{Z}^4$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta = \mathrm{Conv}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,1),\\ (1,1,1,1),(-1,-1,-1,-1),(0,0,0,-1)).\end{aligned}$$

This is a smooth Fano 4-polytope with twelve facets, and we will compute all the possible Δ-maximal fans for this polytope. Because of unimodularity, the fan $\Sigma(\Delta)$ of cones over faces of Δ is a Δ-maximal fan, associated to the standard family of smooth hypersurfaces $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$.

A Δ-maximal fan different from $\Sigma(\Delta)$ must contain a cone $\mathrm{Cone}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$ such that $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ are vertices of Δ forming a basis of N, and $\mathrm{Conv}(v_1, \ldots, v_4)$

is not a face of Δ. There are exactly four such cones:

$$C_1 = \text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,-1))$$
$$C_2 = \text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(1,1,1,1))$$
$$C_3 = \text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(-1,-1,-1,-1))$$
$$C_4 = \text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,1)).$$

The cones C_3 and C_4 respectively contain the vertices $(0,0,0,-1)$ and $(1,1,1,1)$ of Δ, so they cannot be cones in a Δ-maximal fan. However, C_1 and C_2 contain no additional vertices of Δ.

From this information, it can be deduced that there is exactly one Δ-maximal fan other than $\Sigma(\Delta)$. Using the same notation as [7], we will call this fan Σ_{bl} (for reasons that will be explained shortly) and the associated Calabi-Yau family $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$. Σ_{bl} can be obtained from $\Sigma(\Delta)$ by removing the maximal cones

$$C_5 = \text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(1,1,1,1),(0,0,0,-1))$$
$$C_6 = \text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(1,1,1,1),(0,0,0,-1))$$
$$C_7 = \text{Cone}((0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(1,1,1,1),(0,0,0,-1))$$

and replacing them with C_1 and C_2. Σ_{bl} can also be obtained from the fan of cones over the polytope

$$\text{Conv}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,1),(-1,-1,-1,-1)),$$

which is the fan for $\mathbb{P}^4$, by blowing up at the zero-dimensional toric strata associated to the two maximal cones

$$\text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,0,1))$$
$$\text{Cone}((1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(-1,-1,-1,-1)).$$

Because of this, the toric variety associated to Σ_{bl} is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}^4$ blown up at two points. Note that generic members of $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$ are guaranteed to be smooth by Theorem 4.9.

If we intersect the cones $C_1, C_2 \in \Sigma_{bl}$ or $C_5, C_6, C_7 \in \Sigma(\Delta)$ with a transverse hyperplane, we can see the difference between Σ_{bl} and $\Sigma(\Delta)$ in terms of three-dimensional polytopes. In Figure 3 we see that the cross-section for Σ_{bl} consists of two tetrahedra sharing a common facet, while the cross-section for $\Sigma(\Delta)$ consists of three tetrahedra sharing a common edge. This is the same type of wall crossing that occurred in the proof of Proposition 4.6 (see Figure 2). Also compare [6], Example 15.3.9.



FIGURE 3. Cross sections of the fan Σ_{bl} (on the left) and $\Sigma(\Delta)$ (on the right)

Locally analyzing the hypersurface families $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$ and $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$ on these cones shows that they are related by a flop. The flop contracts a single $\mathbb{P}^1$ in each member of $\mathcal{X}(\Delta)$ or $\mathcal{X}_{bl}$ to an ordinary double point, then resolves the ordinary double point to a $\mathbb{P}^1$ in the other family.

6. Application: Nested reflexive polytopes

As an application, we will show how our main result, Theorem 4.9, can be used to construct an *extremal transition* between families of smooth CY threefolds, given any proper inclusion $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$ of reflexive 4-polytopes.

If $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ are families of smooth projective CY varieties, then an extremal transition between $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ is a degeneration of $\mathcal{X}_1$ to a singular family $\mathcal{X}_0$, followed by a resolution of $\mathcal{X}_0$ to $\mathcal{X}_2$. Extremal transitions were originally defined in the paper [11], which also describes how they may be constructed from pairs of reflexive polytopes $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$. The papers [1, 14] discuss the application of this idea to connecting the moduli spaces of different CY families.

Let $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ be Batyrev hypersurface families associated to Δ_1 and Δ_2, respectively. We have a reverse inclusion $\Delta_2^* \subseteq \Delta_1^*$ of dual reflexive polytopes. The monomials in the defining equation of the family $\mathcal{X}_i$ are in bijective correspondence with lattice points in Δ_i^*. We can obtain a degeneration of $\mathcal{X}_1$ by allowing coefficients on monomials associated to the lattice points in $\Delta_1^* \backslash \Delta_2^*$ to approach zero. This results in a singular family $\mathcal{X}_0$ which is birational to $\mathcal{X}_2$. If we can find a resolution of singularities $\mathcal{X}_2 \to \mathcal{X}_0$, then we will have constructed an extremal transition.

In the standard Batyrev construction, the families $\mathcal{X}_1$ and $\mathcal{X}_2$ live in toric varieties $X(\Sigma_i)$, where Σ_i are MPCP resolutions of the fans $\Sigma(\Delta_i)$. This means that to obtain a resolution $\mathcal{X}_2 \to \mathcal{X}_0$ via a toric morphism $X(\Sigma_2) \to X(\Sigma_1)$, we need MPCP resolutions Σ_i such that Σ_2 is a subdivision of Σ_1. However, for an arbitrary pair of reflexive 4-polytopes $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$, the needed MPCP resolutions can fail to exist. The paper [7] gives a counterexample using the reflexive polytope from Section 5.

Thus, to find a toric resolution in all cases, we need to consider Δ-maximal fans rather than just MPCP resolutions. The following result shows that projective Δ-maximal fans suffice to solve the problem for any pair $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$ be reflexive 4-polytopes in $N_{\mathbb{R}}$, and let Σ_1 be any projective Δ_1-maximal fan. Then there exists a projective Δ_2-maximal fan Σ_2 such that Σ_2 refines Σ_1.*

Proof. Let Σ_{GKZ} be the secondary fan associated to $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_r$, the elements of $\partial\Delta_2 \cap N_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $\Gamma_{\Sigma_1,\emptyset} \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ is contained in the moving cone of Σ_{GKZ}. There must be at least one maximal cone $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\mathrm{GKZ}}$ such that $\Gamma_{\Sigma_1,\emptyset} \subseteq \sigma$ and σ is also contained in the moving cone of Σ_{GKZ}. Then σ is associated to a Δ_2-maximal fan Σ_2 which has the needed properties. □

As a result of the lemma, we have:

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\Delta_1 \subseteq \Delta_2$ be a proper inclusion of reflexive 4-polytopes, and let Σ_1 be any projective Δ_1-maximal fan. Then there is at least one projective Δ_2-maximal fan Σ_2 such that an extremal transition between $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma_2)$ exists.*

The results of [10] show that any pair of reflexive 4-polytopes can be connected by a chain of inclusions. Together with the corollary, this implies that given any pair of reflexive 4-polytopes Δ_1 and Δ_2, we can find projective Δ_i-maximal fans Σ_i such that the families $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\Sigma_2)$ can be connected by a finite sequence of extremal transitions between families of smooth projective CY threefolds.

References

[1] A. C. Avram, P. Candelas, D. Jancic, and M. Mandelberg. On the connectedness of the moduli space of Calabi-Yau manifolds. *Nuclear Physics B*, 465:458–472, February 1996.

[2] V. V. Batyrev. Dual Polyhedra and Mirror Symmetry for Calabi-Yau Hypersurfaces in Toric Varieties. *J. Alg. Geom.*, 3:493–535, 1994.

[3] V.V. Batyrev and L.A. Borisov. On Calabi-Yau complete intersections in toric varieties. Andreatta, Marco (ed.) et al., Higher dimensional complex varieties. Proceedings of the international conference, Trento, Italy, June 15–24, 1994. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 39–65, 1996.

[4] L.A. Borisov. Towards the Mirror Symmetry for Calabi-Yau Complete intersections in Gorenstein Toric Fano Varieties. `arXiv:alg-geom/9310001`, 1993.

[5] D.A. Cox and S. Katz. *Mirror symmetry and algebraic geometry.* Mathematical Surveys and Monographs. 68. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 1999.

[6] D.A. Cox, J.B. Little, and H.K. Schenck. *Toric varieties.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics 124. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2011.

[7] K. Fredrickson. Extremal transitions from nested reflexive polytopes. 2014. To appear in *Commun. Math. Phys.* `arxiv:1402.4785`.

[8] W. Fulton. *Introduction to toric varieties. The 1989 William H. Roever lectures in geometry.* Annals of Mathematics Studies. 131. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.

[9] I.M. Gelfand, M.M. Kapranov, and A.V. Zelevinsky. *Discriminants, Resultants, and Multidimensional Determinants.* Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 1994.

[10] M. Kreuzer and H. Skarke. Complete classification of reflexive polyhedra in four dimensions. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 4(6):1209–1230, 2000.

[11] D.R. Morrison. Through the Looking Glass. In *Mirror Symmetry III*, pages 263–277. American Mathematical Society and International Press, 1999.

[12] B. Nill. Gorenstein toric Fano varieties. *Manuscripta Math.*, 116(2):183–210, 2005.

[13] T. Oda and H. Park. Linear Gale Transforms and Gel'fand-Kapranov-Zelevinskij Decompositions. *Tohoku Math J.*, 43(3):375–399, 1991.

[14] C. Ti-Ming, B. R. Greene, M. Gross, and Y. Kanter. Black hole condensation and the web of Calabi-Yau manifolds. *Nuclear Physics B Proceedings Supplements*, 46:82–95, March 1996.

8307 22nd Ave. NW, Seattle, WA, 98117
E-mail address: `karlfredrickson@gmail.com`